



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/756,991 | 01/14/2004 | Cressie E. Holcombe | 25645-30 | 3721 |

7590

07/06/2005

Joseph T. Guy, Ph.D.
Nexsen Pruet Adams Kleemeier, LLC
PO Drawer 10648
Greenville, SC 29603-0648

EXAMINER

MIGGINS, MICHAEL C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1772

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/756,991

Applicant(s)

HOLCOMBE ET AL.

Examiner

Michael C. Miggins

Art Unit

1772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2004.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04162004.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Examiner's Comments

1. Claim 1 contains the limitation "for producing boron nitride" which is an intended use limitation and has been given little too no patentable weight since it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

Claim 1 in general contains very few structural limitations and in fact almost all of the limitations are functional limitations. It is well settled that article and apparatus claims must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function (MPEP 2114). The limitation "that allows reaction contents to be uniformly heated in order to yield boron nitride in a uniform consistency of crystallinity and purity and allows the reaction gaseous products to readily evolve" is a functional limitation which has been given little patentable weight since article and apparatus claims must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function (MPEP 2114).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1772

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ogasawara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,784,978).

Ogasawara et al. disclose a graphite capsule/vessel for producing boron nitride (column 10, lines 15-27) which has a cross-sectional area that allows reaction contents to be uniformly heated in order to yield boron nitride in a uniform consistency of crystallinity and purity and allows the reaction gaseous products to readily evolve (since the vessel has a diameter of 60 mm and a height of 50 mm and the vessel is heated in a furnace resulting in a purity of 98.9%, see column 10, lines 15-27).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2-3 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogasawara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,908,795).

Claims 2-3 and 5-6 are drawn to the dimensions of the graphite vessel. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the dimensions of the graphite vessel would be readily determined through routine experimentation depending on the desired end results absent some showing of unexpected results. Further, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the dimensions recited claims 2-3 and 5-6 in order to provide improved

Art Unit: 1772

purity, crystallinity and reduced porosity, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges or an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art (applies to instant claims 2-3 and 5-6).

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogasawara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,908,795) in view of White et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,978,644).

The difference between the instant claim and Ogasawara et al. is that Ogasawara et al. does not disclose where the gaseous products evolve from an opening that has a width of approximately one-half of the diameter of the capsule/vessel and has a length substantially the same as the capsule/vessel.

White et al. discloses that the porosity of a boron nitride compound is reduced by providing openings in the graphite vessel/mold (column 10, line 55 through column 11, line 26).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to have provided where the gaseous products evolve from an opening that has a width of approximately one-half of the diameter of the capsule/vessel and has a length substantially the same as the capsule/vessel in order to provide reduced porosity as suggested by White.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 1772

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Miggins whose telephone number is 571-272-1494. The examiner can normally be reached on 1:00-10:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Y Pyon can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael C. Miggins
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1772



MCM
June 24, 2005